



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

- ART. II. — 1. *Peerage and Baronetage of the British Empire.* By SIR BERNARD BURKE, LL. D., Ulster King of Arms. Twenty-third edition. London. 1863. Royal 8vo.
2. *The Historic Peerage of England, exhibiting under Alphabetical Arrangement the Origin, Descent, and Present State of every Title of Peerage which has existed in this Country since the Conquest. Being a new Edition of the Synopsis of the Peerage of England.* By the late SIR HARRIS NICOLAS, G. C. M. G. Revised, corrected, and continued to the Present Time, by WILLIAM COURTHOPE, Esq., Barrister at Law. London. 1857. 8vo.
3. *The Vicissitudes of Families.* By SIR BERNARD BURKE, LL. D., Ulster King of Arms. Three series. London. 1859–63. 3 vols. Post 8vo.
4. *The Noble and Gentle Men of England; or, Notes touching the Arms and Descents of the Ancient, Knightly, and Gentle Houses of England, arranged in their respective Counties.* Attempted by EVELYN PHILIP SHIRLEY, Esq., M. A. Westminster. 1859. Small 4to.
5. *Memorials of Samuel Appleton, of Ipswich, Massachusetts; with Genealogical Notices of some of his Descendants.* Compiled by ISAAC APPLETON JEWETT. Boston. 1850. 8vo.
6. *Genealogy of Warren, with some Historical Sketches.* By JOHN C. WARREN, M. D. Boston: Privately printed. 1854. 4to.
7. *An Account of the Temple Family, with Notes and Pedigree of the Family of Bowdoin.* By W. H. WHITMORE. Boston: Privately printed. 1856. 8vo. pp. 16.
8. *Pictures of the Olden Time.* By EDMUND H. SEARS. Boston. 1857. 12mo.
9. *Memorials of the Chauncys, including President Chauncy, his Ancestors and Descendants.* By WILLIAM CHAUNCEY FOWLER. Boston. 1858. 8vo.
10. *A Genealogical Dictionary of the first Settlers of New England, showing Three Generations of those who came before May, 1692.* By JAMES SAVAGE. Boston. 1860–62. 4 vols. 8vo.
11. *A Handbook of American Genealogy; being a Catalogue*

of Family Histories, and Publications containing Genealogical Information, chronologically arranged. By WILLIAM H. WHITMORE. Albany. 1862. Small 4to.

“FOR ten or twelve years,” says Sir Bernard Burke, “before the civil conflict broke out, the most intelligent and zealous of my genealogical clients were from the other side of the Atlantic, all yearning to carry back their ancestry to the fatherland, and to connect themselves in some way with its historic associations. Massachusetts was more genealogical than Yorkshire, and Boston sustained what London never did, — a magazine devoted exclusively to genealogy. My friend Mr. Somerby, a very accomplished American antiquary, employed himself for several years in researches through the parish registers of England for the parochial entries of the founders of the chief American families, and especially of the Pilgrim Fathers; and I have been told that a very large sum was given at New York or Washington — I forget which — for the purchase of a perfect series of our English county histories, as the best sources of American genealogy.”* — *Vicissitudes of Families*, 3d Series, pp. 288, 289.

This statement is a sufficient justification to us for devoting a few pages to subjects so important in studying European history, and so interesting to antiquaries and men of leisure.

The English nobility is of Norman origin. Few of the Saxon families survived the Conquest, and those which did were subjected to the rules of the feudal system, introduced by the Conqueror. The earliest honors were territorial, the counts or earls being governors of counties, with high authority, and the barons feudal tenants. All the tenants *in capite*, whether by knight's service or grand sergeanty, were required to give their attendance upon the sovereign at stated times, and at times to give advice. The transfer of the tenure to another person transferred the honors and duties to him. Thus were created baronies *by tenure*, and such were all the

* The writer has been informed by Charles C. Jewett, Esq., the Superintendent of the Public Library of Boston, that the Library of Congress, at Washington, contains a valuable collection of county histories, and that the Astor Library in New York, and Public Library in Boston, possess collections as complete as it has been possible to make them, the orders in London for them having been unlimited. That in the Boston Library has already cost more than \$4,000. Mr. Jewett also bears testimony to the great demand for them, and the numbers of those who consult them.

great baronies of the earlier Norman kings. It has for a long period been in dispute whether the possession of one of these ancient baronies entitled the owner to a writ of summons to the House of Lords. The question was frequently raised, but never decided until two years ago, when Sir Maurice Berkeley claimed a summons as proprietor of Berkeley Castle, and it was then declared that baronies by tenure had long ceased to exist in England.

Baronies by writ of summons followed the tenure baronies. These were created by a writ of summons issued under the great seal to certain individuals to attend Parliament. Some persons were summoned regularly, others only occasionally, or even only once. The custom varied, also, as to the heirs of a first baron. But if a person summoned actually sat in Parliament, he acquired a barony in fee, which descended like real estate at common law, the males taking in succession, and the females together. In the latter case the barony falls into *abeyance*, and so continues until all the heirs but one are extinct, or until called out of abeyance, in favor of one of the co-heirs, by the sovereign. Most of the older baronies now giving seats in the House of Lords have been derived in this manner, as those of De Ros, De Clifford, Clinton, Hastings, Camoys, Willoughby d'Eresby, and Willoughby de Broke, the peers of these names being descendants in the female line of the original grantees.

But for a long time baronies, as well as all peerages, have been created by patent, and the honor descends according to the limitation contained in the patent, which in England commonly restricts the succession to the male descendants of the first peer, though occasionally it is extended to collateral and female heirs. In Scotland peerages were generally granted to the heirs general, so that it is morally impossible for some of them ever to become extinct.

The foreign title of Viscount, which ranks next above that of Baron, was introduced in the fourteenth century. It has never been very popular, and was very little conferred until the reign of George III. The Viscounty of Hereford, conferred in 1550 upon the Devereux family, is the oldest one giving a seat in the House of Lords. Next, at a long interval,

comes that of Bolingbroke, conferred by Queen Anne on the celebrated statesman.

The title of Earl is the oldest in the peerage, and was, as we have stated, an official name for the governor of a county or province, though not since the Conquest. It has long been the favorite title in England, and in Scotland the earls outnumber all the other peers together. The oldest earldom is that of Shrewsbury, conferred on the Talbots in 1442.

The title of Marquess, next above that of Earl, was seldom conferred until the reign of George III. The oldest marquessate is that of Winchester, enjoyed by the Paulets, upon whom it was conferred in 1551. Next in the English peerage is Lansdowne, created in 1784. In the Scotch peerage there are four marquessates; in Ireland, they are more numerous.

The title of Duke was introduced into England by Edward III., who created his son, the Black Prince, Duke of Cornwall, — a title which descends to all his successors, and gives the Princes of Wales a seat in the House of Lords. The dukedom of Norfolk, created in 1483, is the oldest after Cornwall. That of Somerset dates from 1546. This great title was rarely conferred, except upon princes of the blood, until the reign of Charles II. He and some of his immediate successors were very liberal in bestowing it. Of late, again, it has been bestowed charily, and the number of peers bearing it has actually decreased. The last created were those of Sutherland and Cleveland in 1833. It is understood that it was offered to the late Marquess of Lansdowne and the Earl Fitz-William, but declined by those eminent men.

The House of Lords did not contain more than fifty or sixty persons in the time of the Tudors, and was comparatively small until the accession of Mr. Pitt as Prime Minister in 1783. That statesman recommended a great number for the honors of the peerage, — his peers included the wealthy county families of Lowther, Vernon, Bagot, and Lascelles, and many Scotch and Irish lords; and his successors in office have also generally been liberal in titles. The House of Lords, however, has not kept pace in increase with the population and wealth of the country. The country gentlemen have furnished most of the new creations. Next in numbers probably

comes the bar, and then those distinguished in political and military life. Many families have owed their foundation to trade and commerce; but the number of persons actually engaged in commercial pursuits who have been raised to the peerage has been small. It includes Lords Carrington, Ashburton, Overstone, and Belper. Literature has one very great name, — the late Lord Macaulay. The House of Lords now contains three royal princes, — the Prince of Wales, as Duke of Cornwall, the King of Hanover, as Duke of Cumberland, and the Duke of Cambridge, — twenty other dukes, nineteen marquesses, one hundred and ten earls, twenty-two viscounts, and two hundred and ten barons. This list includes all the hereditary members. There are also sixteen representatives of the peers of Scotland, twenty-eight representative peers from Ireland, and thirty-two bishops, — in all, four hundred and sixty members. The Irish representative peers are chosen for life; those of Scotland, for a single Parliament. While the Scotch and Irish peers are entitled only to select a certain number of their order to represent them, many, and, indeed, all the more influential among them, sit in the House of Lords by virtue of English titles conferred upon them. Thus, the Duke of Hamilton in Scotland sits and votes as Duke of Brandon; the Duke of Buccleuch, as Earl of Doncaster; the Duke of Leinster in Ireland, as Viscount Leinster; and the Marquess of Ormond, as Baron Ormond. The peerages of the three kingdoms number about six hundred and fifty persons, including twenty-seven dukes. While a large number of peers are peers of two out of three kingdoms, only three persons are peers of all, — the Marquesses of Abercorn and Hastings and the Earl of Verulam. An Irish peer, when not entitled to a seat in the House of Lords, may sit in the House of Commons for any constituency out of Ireland. The second Marquess of Londonderry (better known as Lord Castlereagh) and the present Viscount Palmerston are distinguished instances. It has been supposed that this privilege does not extend to Scotch peers; but the question has never been tested.

It is seldom that a commoner is raised at once to a higher rank than Viscount, or even than Baron. George III. did

this but twice,—in 1766, when William Pitt was created Earl of Chatham, and in 1784, when Sir James Lowther was made Earl of Lonsdale; and her present Majesty has done it but three times,—in the cases of Mr. Thomas William Coke of Holkham Hall, the Nestor of the Whig party, created Earl of Leicester in 1837, of Lord Francis Egerton, made Earl of Ellesmere in 1846, and of Lord John Russell, made Earl Russell in 1861.

Certain classes of peers deserve notice. One of these embraces the descendants of illegitimate children of the sovereign. This has never been numerous, but was considerably increased by Charles II. That king, to the great dissatisfaction of the old nobility, created six of his natural sons Dukes of Monmouth, Northumberland, Richmond, Southampton, Grafton, and St. Albans. The Duke of Monmouth forfeited his honors in 1685, and the dukedom has never been restored to his descendant, the Duke of Buccleuch. The dukedoms of Northumberland* and Southampton have become extinct; but the other three still exist, and the families of Lennox, Fitz-Roy, and Beauclerk are among the most influential in England. Charles James Fox, through his mother, Lady Caroline Lennox, was great-great-grandson of Charles II. It was to this pedigree that Burke alluded when he spoke of him as a descendant of Henry IV. of France. James II. created his son by Arabella Churchill, who took the name of Fitz-James, Duke of Berwick. He followed the fortunes of his father, and his honors were therefore forfeited. Entering the service of France, however, he became one of the most skilful captains of the age, and was created Duke of Fitz-James by Louis XIV.,—an honor still enjoyed by his descendants. Another branch is settled in Spain. We remember no other peerage conferred upon the acknowledged natural son of a sovereign till 1831, when the late King William IV. made his son, Colonel Fitz-Clarence, Earl of Munster. This brave and skilful officer's promotion was cordially approved in England.

William III. was very liberal in peerages. Among others, he

* This title, which became extinct in 1716, must not be confounded with those conferred on the Percys.

conferred five English and two Irish peerages upon his Dutch retainers, which, with accompanying grants, were among the causes of his unpopularity. He made Marshal Schomberg Duke of Schomberg, and his son, Meinhardt Schomberg, Duke of Leinster in Ireland. Both these titles, however, soon became extinct. He also raised Bentinck, Zuleistein, D'Overquerque, and Van Keppel to the earldoms of Portland, Rochford, Grantham, and Albemarle, and General Ginkel to the Irish earldom of Athlone. All these titles are now extinct, except those of Bentinck, Duke of Portland, and Keppel, Earl of Albemarle.

The courtesy titles borne by the children of the nobility often greatly confuse foreigners, and are the subjects of egregious blunders on the part of English writers who should know better. The eldest son of every peer of the rank of an Earl is known, during his father's lifetime, by the second title of the latter. The eldest son of the Duke of Devonshire is called Marquess of Hartington, and the eldest son of the Earl of Derby, Lord Stanley. But these gentlemen are merely commoners, and in official papers are called Spencer Cavanish, Esq., and the Right Hon. Edward Stanley, the latter being a Privy Councillor. The younger sons of dukes and marquesses, and the daughters of dukes, marquesses, and earls, have, in the same manner, the prefix of "Lord" and "Lady" to their names; and the younger sons of earls, and the sons and daughters of viscounts and barons, are styled "Honorable." These latter titles are, of course, not transmissible by descent. The title of Lord is now used almost universally for the fifth order of the peerage, instead of Baron. Marquesses and earls are frequently called simply Lords; and sometimes, but now very rarely, dukes also are thus designated.

The civil wars in England, and the changes in property constantly taking place in a country so densely populated, and where mercantile interests are so influential, have made great havoc with the old families. Of those not peers, we shall speak hereafter. Few peerages, except baronies descended through females, date back earlier than the reign of Elizabeth. "All the English dukedoms," says Sir Bernard Burke, "created from the institution of the order down to the reign of

Charles II. are gone, except only Norfolk and Somerset. Winchester and Worcester (the latter now merged in the dukedom of Beaufort) are the only existing marquessates older than the reign of George III. The earl's coronet was very frequently bestowed under the Henrys and Edwards; it was the favorite distinction, besides being the oldest; and yet of all the earldoms created by the Normans, the Plantagenets, and the Tudors, eleven only remain, and of these, six (Arun-
del, Wiltshire, Worcester, Bedford, Rutland, and Lincoln) are merged in higher honors, the only ones giving independent designations being Shrewsbury, Derby, Huntingdon, Pembroke, and Devon. The present House of Lords cannot claim among its members a single male descendant of any one of the barons who were chosen to enforce Magna Charta, or of any one of the peers who are known to have fought at Agincourt; and the noble house of Wrotesley is the solitary existing family among the lords which can boast of a male descent from a founder of the Order of the Garter." Among them, however, are members of the families of Courtenay and Grey.

In deciding the antiquity of families, we are of opinion, with most genealogists, that the direct male line must always be the best. This is the feudal rule, which excluded all females, and in genealogy it is certainly the correct rule, although we do not base our opinion upon the reason given by some one, that it was part of the vassal's duty to keep the secrets of his lord, which a woman could not do. This rule greatly reduces the number of ancient families in the House of Lords. Taking the time when they were first ennobled as the standard, the two oldest there are the Berkeleys, Earls of Berkeley, who were barons by tenure immediately after the Conquest, and the Courtenays, Earls of Devon, who occupied that rank in the twelfth century. The heads of these families were made barons by writ of summons in 1295 and 1299 respectively. The Norman-Irish family of Fitz-Maurice, Marquess of Lansdowne, may probably be ranked next. Under the title of Baron Kerry, it dates from 1181. The Clintons, Dukes of Newcastle, date from 1299, and are the oldest of the ducal houses. Then come the Nevilles, now represented by the Earls of Abergar-

venny, the Talbots, Earls of Shrewsbury, the Howards, Dukes of Norfolk, the Stanleys, Earls of Derby, and the families of Manners, Duke of Rutland, Hastings, Earl of Huntingdon, Devereux, Viscount Hereford, Grey, Earl of Stamford, St. John, Lord St. John and Viscount Bolingbroke, and Wilmoughby, Lord Middleton. All these were peers during the Wars of the Roses. With them also rank the great Scotch houses of Douglas, Hamilton, Gordon, Erskine, Hay, Campbell, Bruce, Lindsey, and Graham, and the Irish families of Fitz-Gerald, Butler, De Courcy, De Burgh, and a few others. The families of the great barons of the first century and a half after the Norman Conquest have almost all died out, but they can hardly be regarded as English. The reign of Henry VIII. saw the rise of many great houses, most of whom were enriched by the spoils of the monasteries. Those of Somerset, Herbert, Russell, Seymour, and Paulet then first appeared in the House of Lords. Queen Elizabeth seldom granted peerages, and was parsimonious of all honors. Lord Burghley, however, her Majesty always made an exception. From him descends the powerful house of Cecil, represented by the Marquesses of Salisbury and Exeter. The Cavendishes were not ennobled until 1605, but two branches attained dukedoms before the end of the century. The Gowers, now Dukes of Sutherland, date from 1712, and the Grosvenors, Marquesses of Westminster, reputed to be the richest family in England, were first made peers in 1761. The Byrons appear in Domesday Book, but Charles I. gave them their barony. He also raised the Feildings to the earldom of Denbigh, and the Quarterly Review remarks, that the first Earl is worthy of notice for two facts, — that he was a lineal male descendant of the Imperial Hapsburgs, and that he was the ancestor of “Tom Jones,” — “two holds upon fame, which like anchors at bow and stern will keep his house’s name stable forever.”* Sir Henry Vane’s son was made Lord Barnard in 1699, and from him descends the Duke of Cleveland.

The Howards are the noblest family in Great Britain, but

* The article from which this and one or two other extracts have been made is one by Mr. James Hannay, upon “The Historic Peerage” of Sir Harris Nicolas, in the number for January, 1858. It has also been republished among the other contributions of Mr. Hannay to the Quarterly Review.

not the most ancient. Two things are remarkable about their origin. First, in a period of Norman ascendancy, they sprang either from the Danes or the Saxons. It is certain that they are not Norman or French. Secondly, in an eminently martial age, the premier house of England owed its origin to the law. Sir William Howard, Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas from 1297 to 1308, is its first known ancestor. His grandson married the heiress of the Mowbrays, Bigods, and Fitz-Alans, and this match made the fortune of his race. The Howards were firm Yorkists, and followed unswervingly the fortunes of the white rose. John Lord Howard was created Duke of Norfolk and Earl Marshal by Richard III. in 1483, and was killed at Bosworth two years later. His son Thomas, who eventually was restored to the dukedom, as Lord Surrey, was the English commander at Flodden Field. The third Duke of Norfolk, and his son Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, the poet, — around whose name such a halo of romance has been thrown, — at first were great favorites with Henry VIII., and were both Knights of the Garter at the same time, — a most unusual honor; but they subsequently fell under the displeasure of the jealous monarch, and were attainted and condemned. Surrey was executed, but the death of Henry saved the life of the unhappy father. In the reign of Elizabeth, the fourth Duke aspired to the hand of the imprisoned Queen of Scots, and entered into a conspiracy to release her. For this he was attainted and beheaded. The dukedom and the office of hereditary Earl Marshal were restored to his descendant in 1660, and have been regularly transmitted to Henry, the eighteenth and present Duke. But it is not alone in the Duke of Norfolk that the Howards flourish. Besides him the Earls of Suffolk, Carlisle, and Effingham, and the untitled Howards of Greystock and Corby, are direct male descendants of Thomas Howard, the second Duke. The Earl of Carlisle and Mr. Howard of Corby descend from “Belted Will Howard,” and owe their fortunes to a marriage with the great heiress of the Dacres, in the seventeenth century. Lord Effingham is the representative of the distinguished Admiral of the time of the Armada. It is somewhat singular that these six branches are equally divided between the Roman Catholic and the English

Churches: the Duke of Norfolk and the Greystocks and Corbys being of the former communion, and the three Earls of the latter. It must not be supposed that all who bear the name of Howard are descended from this house. There are other families in Great Britain and Ireland named Howard, one represented by the Earl of Wicklow, and some descended from a French refugee family of Ouard, who bear no relationship to the Duke of Norfolk.

The Seymours—now in rank the second family in the realm—were a knightly family, of secondary importance, until the marriage of Jane Seymour with Henry VIII., who raised her brother to the Dukedom of Somerset, in 1546. He was subsequently attainted and beheaded, and the title was not restored until 1660. Pride has always marked this distinguished house. Charles, the sixth Duke, commonly called “the proud Duke of Somerset,” needs only a passing reference. “He was in truth,” says Macaulay, “a man in whom the pride of birth and rank amounted almost to a disease.” In the patent of the title, precedence was given to the children of the first Duke by his second wife, so that until the issue of these became extinct on the death of Algernon, the seventh Duke, in 1750, the honors did not fall to the elder line. Sir Edward Seymour, of Berry Pomeroy, the representative of this, and the famous politician of the Revolution, showed the family weakness in a manner that greatly astonished William III., when to the remark of the latter, on their first introduction, “I think, Sir Edward, that you are of the family of the Duke of Somerset,” he haughtily replied, “Pardon me, sir, the Duke of Somerset is of my family.” The Seymours, like the Howards, are Whigs, and the present and twelfth Duke of Somerset is First Lord of the Admiralty in the Palmerston Ministry, and has the reputation of being a man of high administrative ability. The rich Marquess of Hertford represents a younger branch of this family, and, nearly related to him, we may mention Sir Hamilton Seymour, the distinguished diplomatist, formerly Ambassador at St. Petersburg and Vienna.

The Duke of Hamilton, “the head of a house,” says Lord Macaulay, “of almost regal dignity,” is Premier Peer of

Scotland, and chief of the famous Lowland family of Douglas. This dukedom descended to them in the female line from the Hamiltons in the seventeenth century. In addition to his Scottish honors, the Duke of Hamilton is Duke of Brandon in England, Duke of Chatelherault in France, and a Prince of the old German Empire. On the death of the last Duke of Douglas in 1761, the Hamiltons succeeded to the Marquessate of Douglas and the ancient earldom of Angus, and have since resumed the Douglas name. The estates, however, after the celebrated litigation known as the "great Douglas case," went to the female heirs. Few families in Europe are more renowned than this, and few have a nobler residence than theirs in Hamilton Palace. The present and eleventh Duke, by his marriage with the Princess Stephanie, daughter of the Grand Duke of Baden, is closely allied to the present imperial family of France, and to several reigning sovereigns of Germany.

No families in poetry and romance — if even in history — equal the great border houses of Percy of Alnwick and Nevill of Raby. They were near neighbors, closely related, and generally friends, and their influence in the North was supreme. The Percys of history were descended from Josceline of Louvaine, son of Godfrey, Duke of Brabant, who married Agnes De Percy, the daughter and heiress of the last of the Norman barons of Alnwick, and assumed her name. The barony of Percy was conferred upon their descendants in 1299, and the earldom of Northumberland by Richard II. in 1377. Henry, the first Earl, deserted Richard and aided Henry IV. to obtain the throne. Rebelling, in turn, against him, he was slain at Bramham Moor. His son, the gallant Hotspur, had already fallen at Shrewsbury, and his brother, Sir Thomas Percy, Earl of Worcester, the early companion in arms of the Black Prince, had been beheaded immediately after that battle. Henry, Hotspur's son, and second Earl of Northumberland, was restored to the family titles and estates by Henry V., and was killed at St. Albans. His sons, Thomas and Ralph, perished, the one at Northampton and the other at Hedgeley Moor. Henry, third Earl of Northumberland, was slain at Towton in 1461, and the fourth Earl was killed by a mob at Thirsk in 1483. The fifth Earl was the first who died a natu-

ral death, but his second son, Sir Thomas Percy, was attainted and beheaded in 1537. Henry, the sixth Earl, the first lover of Anne Boleyn, compelled by his father to marry, against his own wish, Lady Mary Talbot, lived most unhappily, childless and separate. "At last," says Sir Bernard Burke, "sinking under a broken constitution, he could not bear up against the sorrow brought on by his brother's execution and his house's attainder, but died the very same month in which Sir Thomas had been consigned to the block." Mary restored the earldom in 1557 to Thomas, seventh Earl, son of the preceding Sir Thomas, but he joined in the celebrated rebellion against Elizabeth, known as "the Rising in the North." Defeated in the field, he fled to Scotland, and threw himself upon the protection of one of his hereditary enemies of the border, James Douglas, Earl of Morton, by whom he was basely betrayed to the English government, and executed in 1572. Henry, the eighth Earl, died a violent death in the Tower, while imprisoned there, but whether by his own hand or otherwise is still a mystery. The ninth Earl was convicted of complicity with the Gunpowder Plot, and sentenced to a heavy fine and imprisonment. Algernon, the tenth Earl, espoused the cause of the Parliament in the Civil War, for there was never a time when a Percy was not ripe for rebellion; but by his selfish, vacillating, and even cowardly course, he proved himself hardly worthy of his gallant race. Josceline, the eleventh and last Earl of Northumberland, and the last of the legitimate male line of the Percys, died in 1670, and the title became extinct. His vast estates devolved upon his only daughter, Lady Elizabeth Percy, regarded as the greatest heiress in Europe, whose fortunes were as romantic as those of any of her ancestors. She was married, in name only, when thirteen years of age, to Henry Cavendish, Earl of Ogle, son of the Duke of Newcastle, who died soon afterward. Applicants for the hand of the young widow came from all parts of the kingdom and the Continent. Among these were Thomas Thynne of Longleat, the richest commoner in England, and Count Königsmark, a Swedish adventurer. The family, to prevent the success of the dashing foreigner, hurried up a marriage with Mr. Thynne, and immediately sent the

bride to the Continent. But Königsmark would not give up the great prize so easily. On the night of Sunday, February 12, 1682, Thynne was assassinated by some foreign ruffians, whom it is supposed the Count employed for the purpose. They were subsequently tried and executed, but Königsmark escaped in consequence of lack of evidence to bring the murder home to him. Shortly afterward, the lady married the proud Duke of Somerset. On the death of their son, the seventh Duke, the estates and barony again fell to an heiress, who married Sir Hugh Smithson. His father-in-law had, in 1746, been created Earl of Northumberland with remainder to him, and he now assumed the name of Percy, and was, twenty years later, advanced to the dukedom.* Thus commenced a third family of Percy, descended in the female line from both the others, and to this have descended the ancient barony and most of the estates, including Alnwick. The munificence of the last and of the present Duke will add new lustre to the illustrious name. The former greatly enriched the University of Cambridge, and built the Observatory. The latter has already erected and endowed three churches at his sole expense, and has signified to the Bishop of Durham his readiness to build five more, involving an expenditure of more than £200,000.

“The illustrious names,” says Sir Bernard Burke, “that adorn the family tree of the Nevilles are numerous beyond all precedent. A Neville was Queen of England, and a Neville mother of two of our English monarchs. Twice was a Neville consecrated Archbishop of York, and twice did a Neville fill the dignified office of Lord High Chancellor: seven Nevilles were duchesses, nine Nevilles were Knights of the Garter; a Neville presided over the Commons as Speaker, and Nevilles without end pervade our national records.” The Nevilles, like

* James Smithson, the founder of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, was a natural son of this Duke of Northumberland. He bequeathed his fortune to an illegitimate son of his illegitimate brother, with remainder to the children of the latter, legitimate or illegitimate, and then remainder over to the government of the United States. This last person died, leaving no legitimate issue, and the bequest to his illegitimate issue — they not having been specified by name — was held invalid by the English courts, so that the United States succeeded to Mr. Smithson's splendid gift.

the Howards, were Saxon, and descended from the marriage of Robert Fitz-Maldred, Lord of Raby, and grandson of Cospatric, the Saxon Earl of Northumberland, with Isabel Neville, the heiress of Raby, whose name her husband assumed. Subsequently an heiress brought them the famous Castle of Middleham. Ralph Lord Neville was created Earl of Westmoreland by Richard II. in 1397, and was one of the most powerful subjects England ever saw. From his first marriage descended the Earls of Westmoreland, seated at Raby and Brancepeth. By his second marriage with Joan, daughter of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, he had Richard Lord of Middleham. The latter joined Richard Plantagenet, Duke of York, — who had married his sister, — in rebellion, and was beheaded after the battle of Wakefield in 1460. Edward IV. the next year restored the estates to the son, Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick and Salisbury, “the greatest,” says Hume, “as well as the last of those mighty barons who formerly overawed the crown,” and the hero of one of the best romances in the language. The King-maker, however, found a bloody grave at Barnet. “In 1469,” says Sir Bernard Burke, “the house of Neville attained the acme of its glory. Within exactly one hundred years its ruin was accomplished.” The Earls of Westmoreland had generally been Lancastrians, and, with the Percys, after the Reformation had adhered to the old religion. In 1569 Charles, sixth Earl of Westmoreland, and the Earl of Northumberland, concocted at Brancepeth Castle the Rising in the North. “The Dun Bull” of the Nevilles was again “raised on high,” and joined with the Crescent of the Percys in the last of the many rebellions of the feudal nobility. The effort ignominiously failed, and the honors and great estates of the unfortunate nobleman were forever lost. By the heroic aid of his wife, Lady Jane Howard, daughter of the poet Earl of Surrey, Westmoreland escaped first to Scotland and finally to Flanders, where he lived in poverty and seclusion, supported by a small pension from the king of Spain, until his death in 1601. He left three daughters, who with their mother underwent terrible privations. In 1596, the Bishop of Durham touchingly relates the hardships of one, in a letter to Lord Burghley in her behalf, in which he says, “It were very hon-

ourable for your good lordship to take the case of a most distressed mayden, descended as your lordship knoweth of great nobility, the House of Norfolk, the House of Westmoreland, and the House of Rutland, in memory of man, and was but a child of five years old when her unfortunate father did enter into rebellion." Brancepeth and Raby are now the residences of strangers. Charles I. granted the earldom of Westmoreland to the Fanes. But a branch of the Nevilles still survives. Edward Neville, fourth son of Ralph, first Earl of Westmoreland, married the heiress of Beauchamp, and brought the ancient barony of Abergavenny into the family. This title was raised to an earldom in 1784, and from them have sprung also the Nevilles of Audley End, Lords Braybrooke.

The De Veres, Earls of Oxford, as we learn from Macaulay, "derived their title through an uninterrupted male descent from a time when the families of Howard and Seymour were still obscure, when the Nevilles and Percys enjoyed only a provincial celebrity, and when even the great name of Plantagenet had not yet been heard in England. One chief of the house of De Vere had held high command at Hastings; another had marched, with Godfrey and Tancred, over heaps of slaughtered Moslems, to the sepulchre of Christ. The first Earl of Oxford had been minister of Henry Beauclerc. The third Earl had been conspicuous among the lords who extorted the Great Charter from John. The seventh Earl had fought bravely at Cressy and Poitiers. The thirteenth Earl had, through many vicissitudes of fortune, been the chief of the party of the Red Rose, and had led the van on the decisive day of Bosworth. The seventeenth Earl had shone at the court of Elizabeth, and had won for himself an honorable place among the early masters of English poetry. The nineteenth Earl had fallen in arms for the Protestant religion and for the liberties of Europe, under the walls of Maestricht."

The fortunes of this family have been the theme of another eloquent passage. It was in the Oxford Peerage Case, which arose in 1626, on the death of the eighteenth Earl, that Lord Chief Justice Crewe delivered his famous judgment.

"This great honor," said he, "this high and noble dignity hath continued ever since [its first creation] in the remarkable name of De Vere, by so many ages, descents, and generations, as no other kingdom can produce such a peer in one and the self-same name and title. I find

in all this time but two attainders of this noble family, and those in stormy and tempestuous times, when the government was unsettled, and the kingdom in competition.

"I have labored to make a covenant with myself, that affection may not press upon judgment; for I suppose there is no man that hath any apprehension of gentry or nobleness, but his affection stands to the continuance of so noble a name and house; and would take hold of a twig or a twine thread to uphold it. And yet Time hath his revolutions; there must be a period and end to all things temporal, — *finis rerum*, — an end of names and dignities and whatsoever is terrene; and why not of De Vere? — for where is Bohun? Where is Mowbray? Where is Mortimer? Nay, which is more and most of all, where is Plantagenet? They are entombed in the urns and sepulchres of mortality."

And De Vere has joined them. Aubrey, twentieth Earl, died in 1702, and with him expired, after an existence of five hundred and forty-seven years, the oldest title in Europe. His daughter and heiress married Charles Beauclerk, Duke of St. Albans. In 1711 Queen Anne conferred the title of Earl of Oxford upon Robert Harley, the celebrated statesman. This peerage, too, expired in 1853.

"Inferior," says Macaulay, "in antiquity and splendor to the house of De Vere, but to the house of De Vere alone, was the house of Talbot. Ever since the reign of Edward III., the Talbots had sat among the peers of the realm. The earldom of Shrewsbury had been bestowed in the fifteenth century on John Talbot, the antagonist of the Maid of Orleans. He had been long remembered by his countrymen as one of the most illustrious of those warriors who had striven to erect a great English empire on the Continent of Europe. The stubborn courage which he had shown in the midst of disasters had made him an object of interest greater than more fortunate captains had inspired, and his death had furnished a singularly touching scene to our early stage. His posterity had, during two centuries, flourished in great honor. The head of the family at the time of the Restoration was Francis, the eleventh Earl, a Roman Catholic. His death had been attended by circumstances such as, even in those licentious times which immediately followed the downfall of the Puritan tyranny, had moved men to horror and pity. The Duke of Buckingham, in the course of his vagrant amours, was for a moment attracted by the Countess of Shrewsbury. She was easily won. Her lord challenged the gallant, and fell. Some said the abandoned woman witnessed the combat in man's attire, and others that she clasped her victorious lover to her bosom while his shirt was still dripping with the blood of her husband."

Charles, the twelfth Earl, and afterward Duke of Shrewsbury, the son of the above, the celebrated statesman of the reigns of William III. and Anne, is perhaps the most distinguished member of this house. His abilities and accomplishments were of the highest order, but rendered, except on two great occasions, almost useless to his country, by his hesitating and uncertain temper. From the sweetness of his disposition and the fascination of his manners, he early obtained the title of "King of Hearts," which he retained to the last. Since his death the family has been almost uninterruptedly Roman Catholic, and consequently has seldom taken part in public life. From a Protestant branch sprang Lord Chancellor Talbot, whose descendant, Earl Talbot, was declared in 1858, after a long hearing, to be entitled to the earldom of Shrewsbury, dormant since the death of the seventeenth Earl, two years previously. There is one circumstance of singular and melancholy interest connected with the Talbots. From the tragical death of the eleventh Earl, in 1667, to the present time, the Shrewsbury peerage has never once descended lineally, either to son or grandson, and Earl Talbot traced his connection with it no later than the time of the Wars of the Roses.

Very different has been the fortune of the Scotch Grahams, Marquesses and Dukes of Montrose.

"For seven hundred years," Sir Bernard Burke tells us, "there has never been a collateral succession, since the Grahams first branched off from the family of Dalkeith and Abercorn. On two occasions the grandson succeeded his grandfather, but there is no instance of the direct line being broken. The intermarriages which continued this long line have invariably been with noble families. As far as they can be ascertained for four hundred years, the wives have always been daughters of actual peers. Not one of the successive heads of the house of Montrose has married an heiress, except on one occasion, when a Marquess of Montrose married the younger daughter of the only Duke of Rothes; but as that lady did not share her father's inheritance, she did not, according to the rule in Scotland, bring arms. Thus the Montrose family, one of the noblest in the three kingdoms, has no quarterings, while other families of much shorter duration have quarterings by the hundred." *

* We may here mention a rule of heraldry, about which there would seem to be an enormous amount of ignorance; namely, that a person has no right to quarter or

A branch of the Grahams, then called Græmes, early left Scotland and settled at Esk and Netherby in Cumberland, where, and in Yorkshire and Northumberland, many families of them are still found. They soon distinguished themselves in the constant warfare carried on along the Border, and spread terror far into the interior of Scotland. Nor were they by any means docile subjects to their new sovereigns, but frequently were perfectly impartial between English and Scotch in their depredations. So troublesome indeed were these restless borderers, that upon one occasion intelligence was sent to Westminster, as of great importance, that "*the Græmes are quiet*"! From them came some brave Cavaliers in the civil war; also Richard Graham, Viscount Preston, a minister of James II., and the late Sir James Graham of Netherby Hall, one of the ablest men of the day.

We have already mentioned "the ancient and illustrious house of Courtenay," — as Lord Macaulay terms it, — as one of the two oldest in the House of Lords. The earldom of Devon was conferred upon the Courtenays in 1335 by Edward III., but it was forfeited in two or three generations. Henry VIII. created the chief of the house in his day Earl of Devon and Marquess of Exeter; but he too was subsequently attainted and beheaded, and his son, Edward Courtenay, was shut up in the Tower from boyhood to manhood. He was liberated by Mary, who conferred upon him a third earldom of Devon, and subsequently made him Marquess of Exeter. It is also said that her Majesty designed to bestow her hand upon him, but he unfortunately showed a preference for her sister, the Princess Elizabeth, and was accordingly sent back to prison. He afterwards died unmarried, and his titles, having, as it was supposed, become extinct, lay dormant for more than two hundred and fifty years. The late Sir Harris Nicolas, in the course of other investigations, discovered that in the patent of this earldom of Devon the limiting words "heirs male of his body" had been omitted, so that the honor was granted to the

use in any way the arms of a female ancestor, unless she was an heiress; that is, had no brother, or no brother leaving issue. In Scotland, the rule is even more restricted. A man has the right to impale his wife's arms, and, if she be an heiress, to wear them on an *escutcheon of pretence*.

heirs male generally of the first peer. This omission was doubtless accidental, as so unusual a grant in the English peerage would otherwise have been remembered. Sir Harris Nicolas advised the Courtenays of Powderham Castle, descended from a cousin of the first Earl, to lay claim to the peerage, and the House of Lords adjudged it to them in 1831. The Earl of Devon now ranks third among the earls, and were it not for his ancestor's attainder, he would take precedence of all. The Courtenays claim a direct male descent from Charlemagne.

The most romantic recovery of a peerage was that of the ancient earldom of Huntingdon, by the world-renowned family of Hastings. The title, it was supposed, became extinct in 1789, on the death of the seventh Earl, and the estates went to that nobleman's nephew, the celebrated Earl of Moira, who assumed his name, and was created Marquess of Hastings in 1816. In 1817 a Captain Hans Hastings was residing at a little town in Ireland, as ordnance storekeeper, where he became very intimate with an attorney named Bell. This gentleman was convinced, from some family reminiscences that fell from his friend's mouth, that he was the rightful male heir of his house. With some difficulty he persuaded Captain Hastings to allow him to investigate the matter, the latter writing on the back of the letter in which he gave his consent, "By all that is good, you are mad." Accident threw Mr. Bell, while travelling in England, into the company of an old servant of the Hastingses, and from things wormed out of her he discovered the right clew, and was enabled in a few months to lay a case before Sir Samuel Romilly. That distinguished lawyer took great interest in the matter, gratuitously gave it his close attention, and, after the production of some new evidence suggested by him, declared the claim complete. An application was then made for a writ of summons, and referred by the Prince Regent to the Attorney-General, who unhesitatingly recommended that it be issued, and in less than two years from his first acquaintance with Mr. Bell, Captain Hastings took his seat in the House of Lords as Earl of Huntingdon.

We have spoken of the unlimited manner in which Scotch peerages were granted. Two remarkable instances are those

of Argyll and Breadalbane, enjoyed by the Campbells of Lochow and the Campbells of Glenorchy. As long as Campbells exist who can trace the remotest connection with these, so long will the peerages exist. John Campbell, second Marquess of Breadalbane, died last autumn, without issue; the marquessate became extinct, and the earldom and estates, worth £ 40,000 a year, fell to Mr. Campbell of Glenfalloch, a very distant relative, and a young barrister in London, we believe. About this family, Sir Bernard Burke, in the third series of "The Vicissitudes of Families," tells a story so singular, and yet so authentic, that we think it well worth repeating.

John, third Earl of Breadalbane, in the last century, was childless. The next heirs were Mr. Campbell of Carwhin, a writer to the signet and a bachelor, and Campbell of Glenfalloch, an old Highland laird. With the latter lived his grandson, of whom he was very fond, and whom he regarded with much pride as the future head of the house, presuming upon the extinction of the lives of the Earl and of Carwhin. In 1758 an English visitor at Taymouth Castle met a fine-looking lad in the Highland garb, and, asking who he was, was told, "The young Breadalbane." He subsequently after dinner told the story to his host, and asked who the boy could be. "O," replied Lord Breadalbane, I know who that would be, — that was the young Glenfalloch"; adding, "So he called him the young Breadalbane, did he?" — which remark he constantly repeated to himself during the evening.

"Next morning at break of day," as Sir Bernard tells the story, "a messenger was sent express to summon Campbell of Carwhin, the retired man of business from Edinburgh, who, as an old bachelor, had lately settled in his own little place to end his days in peace. When he arrived, and was welcomed, Lord B. said to him, 'Now, Carwhin, you can't guess why I sent for you.' 'Oo! anything to pleasure your lordship.' 'Well, I'll tell you what it is. I want you to marry.' 'Me marry! Breadalbane, I hae naething to marry on.' 'O, I'll make that easy for you, Carwhin.' 'Weel, but if I ever so weel inclined, I dinna ken ony body that wud tak me.' 'Well, Carwhin, I've a remedy for that too. You'll go to Inverary, where the Circuit Court meets soon; get introduced to Miss ———, the daughter of Lord ———, one of the judges who is to be there. I'll warrant she'll take you.' 'Weel,

Breadalbane, onything to pleasure your lordship.' Off he set in his best, got introduced to the young beauty, danced with her, took her to supper, and proposed. He was, however, refused, and, much disconcerted, he applied to a bosom friend, and explained the case. His friend said, 'If all you want is to pleasure Breadalbane, try Betty Stonefield, I 'se warrant she 'll no' refuse you.' This was a maiden sister of Lord Stonefield, the other judge on the Circuit, who was a Campbell, but neither young nor handsome. Carwhin took the advice, went through the same form, and was accepted; and the son and heir of this curiously planned marriage was no other than John Campbell of Carwhin, who succeeded eventually, to the exclusion of young Glenfalloch, as fourth Earl of Breadalbane. But events are not to be controlled: this fourth Earl's only son, John, fifth Earl and second Marquess of Breadalbane, has just died childless, and young Glenfalloch's great-grandson is, after all, despite the jealousy of the old Earl and the cannie courtship of Carwhin, now Earl of Breadalbane."

The house of Stanley is Saxon. It is descended from a younger branch of the Audeleys, and derived the name of Stanley from the manor of Stanley in Staffordshire. Sir John Stanley, K. G., Lord Deputy of Ireland, in 1381 married the heiress of Latham, and thus became possessed of Knowesley, near Liverpool, the seat of his descendants ever since. He also received from the king of England the kingdom of the Isle of Man as a fief, which remained for three centuries in the family. The first Earl of Derby, who received that honor from Richard III. in 1483, was brought up a Lancastrian, but, marrying a Neville, became connected with the Yorkists. He conducted himself with great circumspection, however, so much so that he came out of the civil wars richer than before, and saved his estates and honors. At one time he appeared at the court of Edward IV. with both Roses entwined in his helmet. His successors showed equal caution, and this ancient earldom, with the accompanying estates, has never been forfeited. The second Earl was the Stanley of Flodden Field, and the seventh a brave Cavalier, who ended his life upon the scaffold. His Countess, a Huguenot lady, distinguished herself by her gallant defence of Latham House, against the Puritan forces. She figures as one of the leading characters of "Peveril of the Peak," where Sir Walter Scott sees fit to make her a Roman Catholic. Edward Geoffry

Stanley, the fourteenth and present Earl, and the chivalrous leader of the Conservative party, very early showed such aptitude for Parliamentary life as to cause Macaulay to pay him the remarkable compliment of saying, that, "with the exception of Mr. Stanley, whose knowledge of the science of Parliamentary defence resembles an instinct, it would be difficult to name a single eminent debater who has not made himself master of his art at the expense of his audience." When Lord Derby was Prime Minister in 1858, his son, Lord Stanley, a young man of high ability, was one of the Secretaries of State, a thing that has no parallel since the time of Lord Burghley and his son Robert Cecil in the reign of Elizabeth. Lord Derby, and Lord Palmerston, the leader of the Liberal party, are both descended from Saxon families not wanting in historic names; both are beyond all question the most distinguished ornaments of those families; and both represent younger lines,—the heads of the families being baronets, Sir William Stanley and Sir Grenville Temple.

The two great historical families of Ireland are the Fitz-Geralds, or "Geraldines," Dukes of Leinster, and the Butlers, Marquesses of Ormond. The Fitz-Geralds went to Ireland with Strongbow, and divided into two branches, represented by the Earls of Kildare and Desmond. The latter title has long remained dormant, although genealogists think there are heirs still existing. The Earls of Kildare received that title in 1316. For a long time they were the most powerful barons in Ireland, and the office of Lord Deputy seemed almost hereditary with them. Then they were rivalled, and at length eclipsed, by their enemies, the Butlers. Since the Revolution, the Fitz-Geralds have recovered the first place among the Irish nobility, and the twentieth Earl of Kildare was made Duke of Leinster. The Marquess of Kildare, son of the present Duke, has recently published the History of the Earls of Kildare and their Family from 1157 to 1772, in which much light is thrown upon the condition and the society of Ireland during that long, dark, and turbulent period. The apes which constitute the crest and supporters of the Leinster arms originated, according to the family legend, in the infant heir of the house having been taken out of his

cradle and carried to the topmost battlements of the castle by an ape, that held him there for some time, to the great consternation and horror of the family and friends, but at length brought him down in safety. The Marquess of Kildare tells us that Dean Swift, when he wrote *Gulliver's Travels*, had quarrelled with the Earl of Kildare of that day, and in order to vex him introduced the account of Gulliver's being carried off by the Brobdignagian ape.

The Butlers descend from Robert Fitz-Walter, a scion of one of the most powerful Norman families, who was made Hereditary Chief Butler of Ireland in 1177. His descendants were created Earls of Ormond in 1328. This family attained its highest power in the person of the great James Butler, twelfth Earl and first Duke of Ormond, the most illustrious of the Cavaliers of the civil war, and for a quarter of a century Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. He and his son, the Earl of Ossory, wore the Garter at the same time. He was also Chancellor of the University of Oxford, and the party which in his days obtained the name of Tory regarded him as its head and leader; for his sure judgment, intrepid courage, high integrity, pure character, and checkered fortunes elicited for him the respect and admiration of the bitterest Roundheads. The Duke died in 1688, and was succeeded by his grandson, a prominent actor in the Revolution, but who on the death of Anne joined the Jacobites and fled the country. The dukedom subsequently became extinct, but the other honors passed to a cousin, whose descendant still resides in the old feudal mansion of Kilkenny Castle. From the Restoration to the death of Anne, the Dukes of Ormond were probably the most powerful noblemen in the United Kingdom.

The family of Gorges — a name forever identified with the early history of New England — was for many generations of no small importance in the West. The name of Ralph de Gorges, the founder, appears on the Roll of Battel Abbey, and he received grants of many a fine manor in Dorset, Wilts, and Somerset. In the fourteenth century, two of his descendants were successively summoned to Parliament, and took their seats as Baron Gorges, — an honor now in abeyance. The heiress of the last Lord, Agnes de Gorges, married Sir

Theobald Russell of Kingston-Russell. Their eldest son assumed the name and arms of Gorges; the younger retained his paternal name, succeeded to the estate of Kingston-Russell, and was the ancestor of the powerful Bedford family. In the reign of Edward IV., Sir Edmund Gorges of Wraxall in Somersetshire was the ward of John Howard, first Duke of Norfolk, and married that nobleman's eldest daughter. Their oldest son continued the Wraxall line. The younger, Sir Edward, was ancestor of the family settled at Langford in Wiltshire, which received a baronetcy from James I., and, in 1620, the Irish barony of Gorges of Dundalk, — honors that became extinct in 1712. Of this branch was Sir Arthur Gorges, the translator of Bacon's "Wisdom of the Ancients," and himself an author. It was on the death of his wife, a Howard, that the poet Spenser wrote "Daphnaida"; and in the dedication to the Marchioness of Northampton he says: "The occasion why I wrote the same was as well the great good fame which I heard of her deceased, as the particular good will which I bear unto her husband Master Arthur Gorges, a lover of learning and vertue, whose house as your ladyship by marriage hath honoured,* so doe I find the name of them, by many notable records, to be of great antiquitie in this realme, and such as have ever borne themselves with honourable reputation to the world, and unspotted loyaltie to their prince and countrey: besides, so lineally are they descended from the Howards as that the Lady Anne Howard, eldest daughter to John Duke of Norfolke, was wife to Sir Edmund, mother to Sir Edward, and grandmother to Sir William and Sir Thomas Gorges." Two great-grandsons, in the elder line, of Sir Edmund and Lady Anne Gorges, were Sir Edward Gorges of Wraxall, and his younger brother, the celebrated Sir Ferdinando Gorges. The latter was a captain in the navy, and Governor of Plymouth. In early life he was implicated in the conspiracies of the Earl of Essex, and seems to have betrayed them to Sir Walter Raleigh in a manner which, as related by Hume, was not very honorable; but it is not too much to suppose, from the subsequent high character of Sir

* Lady Northampton married, for her second husband, Sir Thomas Gorges, uncle of Sir Arthur.

Ferdinando, that, if all were known, his conduct upon this occasion would appear in a better light. He afterwards appears in English history as refusing to fight, and even sailing back to England, when commanding a ship in the fleet ostensibly sent out to aid the Huguenots of France, but which it was intended should fight against them. But Sir Ferdinando is chiefly distinguished in connection with the settlement of New England, and his efforts to colonize Maine, of which he had a grant. Sir Edward Gorges had a large family, of whom the eldest, Sir Robert, married a daughter of Sir Marmaduke Dayrell, but died early, leaving no male issue, and the next son, Samuel, succeeded to the estates. During the civil wars, the family vindicated Spenser's praise of their "unspotted loyalty." Sir Ferdinando Gorges, although then quite aged, distinguished himself on more than one occasion; and we suspect, had he been less devoted to his Church and his sovereign, he would have stood higher in the favor of the Puritans of New England. Samuel Gorges was nominated as one of the Knights of the projected Order of the Royal Oak, and his estate is in that list valued at six hundred pounds a year. He had probably been greatly impoverished during the preceding troubles. In his son the male line of Wraxall ended, and that estate has, we believe, descended to Lord Poltimore. Dr. Palfrey intimates an opinion that there was a relationship between Raleigh and Gorges, through the Champernownes; but, after a close examination of the pedigrees of these families, we have failed to discover any. Hamilton Gorges, Esq., of Kilbrew, county of Meath, in Ireland, is believed to represent the only male line remaining of this honorable house. We have met with persons of the name of George in New England who claimed descent from Sir Ferdinando Gorges; but there is pretty decisive evidence that none of the Gorges family ever settled in New England, while several of the name of George did, as will be seen by reference to Savage's "Genealogical Dictionary." The name of Gorges seems to have been derived from *gurges*; and the arms of the family are *Or, a whirlpool azure*.

It is impossible for us to trace the connection with history of many other families rivalling in antiquity and achievements

those which he have noticed. The Bohuns, Earls of Hereford ; the Mortimers, Earls of March ; the powerful Staffords, Dukes of Buckingham, immortalized by Shakespeare, and who fell victims to Wolsey's anger and jealousy ; and the Poles, Dukes of Suffolk, from whom sprang "the last and best of the Roman Catholic Archbishops of Canterbury, the gentle Reginald Pole," — would be particularly worthy of more attention than we can now give them. The latter family was founded by commerce, being descended from William De-la-Pole, whom Edward III., in a public document, termed "my beloved merchant." "He was," says the Quarterly Review, "a grand merchant of Kingston-upon-Hull, who on one occasion had sent the king a thousand pounds in gold, and on another provided 'sixty tuns of wine for the king's army,' 'to be conveyed to Berwick-on-Tweed.' Nor did the king repay him with mere empty honors ; he paid him in hard cash, and gave him a good manor. He summoned his son, Michael De-la-Pole, to Parliament in 1366. Michael became Admiral of the king's fleet in the North, and in 1385 Earl of Suffolk. Henceforth their history is that of a family of the highest aristocracy. They fought at Agincourt ; they suffered attainders, and rose again ; they became Dukes of Suffolk, K. G.'s, Lord Chancellors ; married with Edward IV.'s sister ; and finally perished of too much greatness in the reign of Henry VIII. And all this greatness arose out of trade in a country town, and in an age when, according to popular notions, we might have expected trade to be obscure and despised." The Sackvilles, Earls and Dukes of Dorset, — a race which has become extinct in our own time, — and the families of Russell, Cavendish, Herbert, Devereux, Cecil, Spencer, Villiers, and many others, have all been connected with the history of England in a way that will prevent their memory from dying, whatever may become of honors and estates.

A word may be added with regard to the connection of America with the peerage. The three most distinguished law peerages conferred in recent times are undoubtedly those borne by Lord Lyndhurst, Lord Brougham, and Lord Abinger. It is well known that Lord Lyndhurst is a native of Boston, but perhaps not so well known that Lord Abinger, formerly

Sir James Scarlett, probably the most brilliant man of the three, was a native of Jamaica. American peeresses are more numerous. We remember five from the United States. Three of these were daughters of Richard Caton, Esq., of Maryland, and married the Duke of Leeds, the Marquess Wellesley, and Lord Stafford. The wife of the first and mother of the present Lord Ashburton was the daughter of the Hon. William Bingham of Philadelphia; and the daughter of General John Cadwalader of that city married the second Lord Erskine, and was the mother of the present peer of that name.

The same family frequently branches off into several peerages, and often different families bearing the same name are found on the roll of the House of Lords. There are eight peers who bear the family name of Stewart or Stuart; five each bearing those of Erskine and Howard; four each for those of Browne, Butler, Campbell, Douglas, Egerton, Hamilton, Plunket, and Scott; and three each for the names of Boyle, Cavendish, Hay, Herbert, Hill, Montagu, Russell, Stanhope, and Wellesley. Double names, very rarely, if ever, met with in the United States, have been growing more and more common among the upper classes in England, where they were introduced from the Continent less than two centuries ago, and are generally borne as surnames by all the members of the family. Familiar instances are Ashley-Cooper, Seymour-Conway, Pelham-Clinton, Wentworth-Fitz-William, Hamilton-Douglas, Petty-Fitz-Maurice, and, last but not least, Bulwer-Lytton, — a name so distinguished as to prove its bearer's own adage, that

“Beneath the rule of men entirely great,
The pen is mightier than the sword.”

Recent times have introduced Montagu-Douglas-Scott, Haggerston-Constable-Maxwell, Sutherland-Leveson-Gower, and the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos delights in the compound of Temple-Nugent-Brydges-Chandos-Grenville.

Burke's Peerage and Baronetage is certainly the best for Americans to buy, as it gives in the smallest space the fullest account of the histories and pedigrees of all families now enjoying hereditary honors, while Lodge's takes two volumes, and more expensive ones, for much less information respecting

the peers alone. "The Historic Peerage," by the late Sir Harris Nicolas, confines itself to the history of the titles ; families, marriages, and issue being entirely omitted. It gives the most succinct account of all the peerages that have existed in England since the Conquest, so that the reader, by reference, can find out in a few moments who bore any title at any specific period. Take, for example, the Duke of Buckingham. In the last four centuries this favorite title has been borne by four historic families, — Stafford, Villiers, Sheffield, and Grenville. A person reads of a Duke of Buckingham in the reign of Charles II., and, within twenty years, of a Duke of Buckingham in the time of Anne. A moment's reference will show him that the first title was in the Villiers family, and became extinct in 1687, and that it was very shortly after granted to John Sheffield, Earl of Mulgrave, the poetaster. The value of a moderately sized and priced volume giving such information will at once be seen by all who have ever made the history of England a study, and indeed the Quarterly Review does not "hesitate to pronounce it as necessary a companion to the student of English history, as Johnson's Dictionary to the student of the English language."

"The Vicissitudes of Families," by Sir Bernard Burke, of which we have made no sparing use, is the title of three small volumes of essays by that accomplished genealogist and antiquary, written in leisure moments, — which cannot be very numerous with him, — and consisting mostly of facts and anecdotes coming to his knowledge in the course of his professional investigations. All of these are interesting, and some of them intensely so, rivalling the strangest tales of romance. Had we room, we could extract many heart-rending accounts of the decline and fall of honored names, and of peers and baronets in poverty and beggary. We cannot forego making the following quotation, as it concerns descendants of perhaps the ablest race of princes that has ever existed.

"What race in Europe surpassed in royal position, personal achievement, and romantic adventure our own Plantagenets, — equally wise as valiant, and no less renowned in the cabinet than in the field? But let us look back only so far as the year 1637, and we shall find the great-great-grandson of Margaret Plantagenet, herself the daughter

and heiress of George, Duke of Clarence, following the cobbler's craft at Newport, a little town in Shropshire! Nor is this the only branch from the tree of royalty that has dwarfed and withered. If we were to closely investigate the fortunes of the many inheritors of the royal arms, it would soon be shown that, in sober truth,

‘The aspiring blood of Lancaster
Had sunk into the ground,’

ay, and deeply too. The princely stream flows through very humble veins. Among the lineal descendants of Edmund of Woodstock, Earl of Kent, sixth son of Edward I., king of England, entitled to quarter the royal arms, occur a butcher and a toll-gatherer, — the first, a Mr. Joseph Smart of Hales Owen; the latter, a Mr. George Wilmot, keeper of the turnpike gate at Cooper's Bank near Dudley. Then, again, among the descendants of Thomas Plantagenet, Duke of Gloucester, fifth son of Edward III., we discover Mr. Stephen Jones Penny, the late sexton of St. George's, Hanover Square."

The literary merit of these essays is unequal, and most of them bear evidences of haste. The best are in the first series, and those on the Percys, Nevilles, and Cromwells are superior to almost any other compositions of the kind we have ever read. Notwithstanding the vast amount of detail which Sir Bernard has to condense into brief, set phrases in his "Peerage" and "Landed Gentry," his style is singularly easy and agreeable, and well suited to this kind of writing, although occasionally approaching a little too near to that of the "Court Journal" and "Morning Post." We earnestly advise all to read these agreeable volumes, being certain that the pleasure and instruction to be derived from them will fully repay for the necessary time and trouble. Sir Bernard Burke deserves well from all Americans, both because of the interest and partiality with which he regards this country, — which is evidenced in part by his chapter on the Pilgrim Fathers in this work, — and because of the courtesy and willingness with which he responds to all applications for genealogical information.

"The Noble and Gentle Men of England," by Mr. Evelyn Philip Shirley, M. P., consists of brief notes made by a gentleman of leisure upon the ancient families of England, titled and

untitled, which fall within the rules laid down by him, and best stated in his own language.

“The following imperfect attempt to bring together a few notes relating to the ancient aristocracy of England is confined, in the first place, to families *now existing*, and regularly established either as *knightly* or *gentle* houses before the commencement of the sixteenth century; secondly, no notice is taken of those families who may have assumed the names and arms of their ancestors in the *female line*, for the truth is, as it has been well observed, ‘that, unless we take the *male line* as the general standard of genealogical rank, we shall find ourselves in a hopeless state of confusion’; thirdly, illegitimate descent is of course excluded. In those cases where the whole landed estate of the family has been dissipated, although the male line still remains, all notice is omitted, such families having no longer any claim to be classed in any county. This list also, it must be remembered, does not profess to give an account of all those families whose descent may possibly be traced beyond the year 1500, but merely of those who were in the position of what we now call *county families* before that period.”

The enforcement of these rules, and a most severe and jealous sifting of all pedigrees, and rejection of “those modern accounts of family history which, by ascribing the most absurd pretensions of ancient lineage to families who bore no real claim to that distinction, have done much to bring genealogy itself into contempt,” of course greatly reduce the number honored with a place in Mr. Shirley’s little work. But we cannot agree with those reviewers who are astonished at the smallness of this select circle. It is quite as large as we should have expected, and Mr. Shirley gives only one head to every family, no matter how many may be its ramifications. All the branches of the Howards, for example, appear under “Howard of East Winch.” The senior line is, as a rule, set down, although younger ones may have far outgrown it. The Marquess of Winchester appears under “Powlett of Hinton St. George”; Viscount Falkland, under “Cary of Torr Abbey.” Where, however, the younger line is seated on the old ancestral estate, it is preferred, so that the Duke of Marlborough figures as an offshoot of “Spencer of Althorp,” and Earl Ferrers under “Shirley of Eaton.”

On the Continent, where titles are less regarded than in England, and the term *noble* applies to all entitled to bear arms, all the families in this book would be considered as of very high nobility, and many of those not ennobled do hold chief places in history and genealogy. Such a one is the great Cornish house of Trelawney of Trelawney. Indeed, Cornwall is a famous county for old families, and the nature of their names is exemplified in the couplet,

“By Tre, Pol, and Pen
You shall know the Cornish men,” —

the truth of which is proved by Trelawney, Trevelian, and Tremayne, Polwhale and Pollexfen, Pendarvis and Pendennis. Sir John Trelawney, Bishop of Bristol, and one of the famous seven sent to the Tower by the worst of English kings, was of this family; and the following passage from Macaulay exhibits his influence in his native county.

“The people of Cornwall, a fierce, bold, and athletic race, among whom there was a stronger provincial feeling than in any other part of the realm, were greatly moved by the danger of Trelawney, whom they honored less as a ruler of the Church than as the head of an honorable house, and the heir through twenty descents of ancestors who had been of great note before the Normans had set foot on English ground. All over the county was sung a song, of which the burden is still remembered :

‘And shall Trelawney die, and shall Trelawney die?
Then thirty thousand Cornish boys will know the reason why.’”

The miners, from their caverns, re-echoed the song with a variation :

“Then twenty thousand under ground will know the reason why.”

Mr. Marmion Ferrers, of Baddesley Clinton, in Warwickshire, represents the only remaining line “of what was perhaps,” says Mr. Shirley, “during the Middle Ages the most powerful Norman family in England,” descended from Henry De Feriers, of the time of the Conquest, “who held in chief two hundred and ten lordships in fourteen counties, besides the castle and borough of Tutbury in Staffordshire.” Were it not that an attainder in the time of Henry III. blocks the way, Mr. Ferrers would be Earl of Derby, with a coronet

dating from 1138, older even than the renowned one of Oxford. Sir Alexander Malet, now in the diplomatic service, is the sole survivor of the families of those renowned twenty-five barons selected to enforce Magna Charta. But we cannot enter into farther details. Besides those we have mentioned, the families of Acland, Bacon (Premier Baronets, but far more celebrated for giving England Lord Keeper Bacon and his illustrious son), Burdet, Carew, Dymoke (the hereditary champion), Fairfax, Fitzherbert, Harcourt, Harley, Howard of Corby and Howard of Greystock, Kingscote, Mordaunt, Musgrave, Popham, Rokeby ("a knightly race immortalized by Scott"), Scrope, Shirley of Easington, Throckmorton, Vernon-Wentworth, and Wyndham, — all commoners, — can vie with the greatest in the land in antiquity, in historical associations, and in many cases in wealth. Wales is omitted from Mr. Shirley's book, we know not why, except it be that he was appalled at the thought of the far-famed Welsh genealogies, and this excludes Devereux and Hastings, not now landed proprietors in England. We do not know why Somerset and Herbert are excluded by Mr. Shirley, and were a little surprised not to find in his collection some other families, such as Bertie and Cecil. There must of course be some accidental omissions. With each family is an engraving and description of its ancient arms; and the simplicity of almost all of these cannot fail to strike the reader. The hideous coats allowed in later times, and which crowd modern books of arms, are proof of the recent origin as well as of the bad taste of the grantees.

In the civil wars of the seventeenth century, the "Gentlemen of England" bore by far the most prominent part. Hyde, Hopton, Langdale, Acland, Cromwell, Hampden, Vane, Eliot, Pym, St. John, and many others of the leaders on the royal and on the Parliamentary side came from the country squires. Cromwell was no brewer, as some have called him, but the cadet of a good Huntingdonshire family. His uncle and godfather, Sir Oliver Cromwell, was an active Cavalier, and to the last refused to acknowledge the government of the Protector. It is a singular circumstance, that the mothers of Hampden and of Whalley the regicide were of the Cromwell family.

The extraordinary passion for genealogy which has raged during the last twenty years in the United States will be fully comprehended by one who turns over the pages of Mr. Whitmore's valuable bibliographical work, entitled "Hand-book of American Genealogy,"* containing a catalogue, with critical notices, of the very numerous books which have been published on the subject in America. The larger portion of these are filled with a wilderness of closely printed names, through which it is tiresome to thread one's way, and which are of little interest outside of the family recorded. The United States has also produced the most stupendous work on genealogy ever compiled; for when we consider the obscurity of most of those whose names are included in it, their number, and the difficulty of obtaining information respecting them, we do not hesitate so to designate Mr. Savage's "Genealogical Dictionary of the Early Settlers of New England." Even Collins's great Peerage and Burke's Landed Gentry must have been far less laborious undertakings. We have placed at the head of this article three or four of the most interesting New England family histories, and to these we can but briefly allude.

The "Memorials of Samuel Appleton," by the late Mr. Appleton Jewett, contains a full genealogical account of a family which has attained wealth and distinction in Massachusetts. Samuel Appleton emigrated from Great Waldingfield in Suffolk to Ipswich in this Commonwealth, in 1635. A Herald's Visitation contains the pedigree of the Appletons of Waldingfield back to John Appulton, living there in 1412, and that the family was early of consequence is proved by some of their monuments as contained in Weever. This is direct and satisfactory; it is only necessary to supply one link to complete it to the present time, and that is to identify Samuel Appleton who emigrated to America with the Samuel Appleton mentioned in the pedigree. This is done with all reasonable certainty, and the family, though respectable, was not of so much importance as to make it strange that a younger son should leave his native country in those

* This beautiful book was published by subscription, and the impression limited to one hundred copies.

times. We do not see, therefore, were the Appletons still landed proprietors in England, but that they would be entitled to a page in Mr. Shirley's book.

The "Genealogy of Warren," by the late Dr. John C. Warren, is more ambitious, and in typography and general preparation the most splendid work of the kind ever prepared in this country. Dr. Warren gives an account of the way in which he was first led to investigate his pedigree, and the means he employed; and says, at the end of the Preface, that, "after three or four years of inquiry and discussion on both sides of the Atlantic, a very fair and satisfactory genealogical table has been formed." The pedigree is traced from no less a person than the first Earl of Warren and Surrey, son-in-law of the Conqueror, through the Warrens of Poynton in Cheshire and the Warrens of Headboro' in Devonshire, to John Warren, who came to this country very early.

Newly compiled pedigrees should always be submitted to pretty strict tests, and for ourselves we are very sceptical with regard to all genealogies going back beyond Elizabeth, except when coupled with uninterrupted possession of estates or titles. The former Visitations of counties furnish good evidence where an unquestioned connection can be made with them, but here lie the chief difficulties; and of course, the more ancient the genealogy, the more numerous they are. If in early times a cadet of a gentle family removed from one county, and founded a family in another, some evidence can generally be discovered to prove the fact; and where there is none save the name, the identity of a man in Devonshire with the son of a Cheshire squire is open to grave question. When a person comes from the same county with a noble family of his name, it is insufficient to connect him with it. Independently of illegitimate descents, in former times, when surnames were scarce, the servants of a great house often became known by that of their master. A person named John Percy, therefore, if he comes from the neighborhood of Alnwick or Petworth, may have been descended from an Earl of Northumberland, or may have been descended from his footman. Long pedigrees are no modern invention. The Saxon pedigree of her present Majesty is lost in the maze of fable and mythology, and Leland traced the De Veres back to Noah!

We must be allowed to say, that the genealogy of Warren has not appeared to us by any means so "fair and satisfactory" as it did to its distinguished compiler. We should express our views with much greater diffidence, had we not discovered that they agreed with those of so experienced a genealogist as Mr. Whitmore.* The book contains some valuable sketches of the Earls of Warren and Surrey, General Joseph Warren, and others bearing the name.

The "Account of the Temple Family," by Mr. Whitmore, is little more than a pedigree; but it is one of a house "which," says Macaulay in his essay upon Sir William Temple, "long after his death produced so many eminent men, and formed such distinguished alliances, that it exercised, in a regular and constitutional manner, an influence in the state scarcely inferior to that which, in widely different times, and by widely different arts, the house of Neville attained in England, and that of Douglas in Scotland. . . . Within the space of fifty years, three First Lords of the Treasury, three Secretaries of State, two Keepers of the Privy Seal, and four First Lords of the Admiralty were appointed from among the sons and grandsons of the Countess Temple." The resignation of Lord Grenville in 1807, with which the long rule of his branch of this family may be said to have terminated, brought into office and upon the stage another Temple, in the person of the great Minister who still rules England, — who in vigor and capacity has rivalled Richelieu, and in the length of his official services has surpassed Metternich, while he has made his influence to be felt and his name respected far beyond the confines of Europe, in countries where the most celebrated Continental ministers are entirely unknown. From the marriage of the heiress of Temple with Richard Grenville sprang the Dukes of Buckingham and Chandos, and among the descendants of this now famous family in the last two centuries have been Sir William Temple, Lord Cobham, and Lord Palmerston, and in the female line, Earl Temple, George and William Wyndham, Thomas Grenville, the second William Pitt, the late Lord Nugent, the present accomplished Earl Stan-

* Handbook of American Genealogy, pp. 102, 103.

hope, and we may add, upon this side of the Atlantic, Mr. Robert Charles Winthrop.

Mr. Whitmore gives the celebrated pedigree from Leofric, Earl of Mercia, the husband of the Lady Godiva of Coventry, which is generally considered apocryphal, although Collins seems to place some confidence in it. Mr. Shirley evidently disbelieves it, as he does not include the family in his book. Mr. Whitmore says that Leofric "was chiefly instrumental in raising Edward the Confessor to the throne, as well as his successor, King Harold II.;" and adds, "He died 31 August, 1027." Now Edward the Confessor did not ascend the throne until 1041, nor did Harold until 1066,—a date not easily forgotten. This may be a fault of the printer, but we think the grim Earl will live longer in Mr. Tennyson's poetry than he will in sober history.

The very interesting work by Rev. Edmund H. Sears, entitled "Pictures of the Olden Time," is composed of a series of sketches illustrating times and scenes in the history of the numerous Massachusetts family of Sears. We should probably differ widely from Mr. Sears in opinion respecting some of the events he records, but there can be but one voice regarding the graceful manner in which he has executed his very happily conceived plan for commemorating his ancestors. The Searses descend from John Sayer, an alderman of the borough of Colchester, in the early part of the sixteenth century, and by a more shadowy pedigree are traced to a Kentish family in the fourteenth century. This part of the line is broken, and indeed closely resembles the pedigree given by Dr. Holmes, of the Saymores, in "Elsie Venner." No connection save that of the name is shown. After Alderman Sayer's time, the family formed alliances with the noble house of Bouchier, through a daughter of Sir Edmund Knyvett, and during a residence in Holland with the Van Egmonds. These are evidently their pride. Mr. Sears makes a not uncommon mistake in speaking of the daughter of Sir Edmund Knyvett as the Lady Anne. Richard Sayer came from Amsterdam to New England, and settled in Chatham. The greater part of the chapter on the Pilgrim Fathers, in "The Vicissitudes of Families," is filled with the adventures of the Sayers, and Sir Bernard Burke thus describes the house of Richard Sayer:—

“On Quivet Neck he built himself a house, one-story high, roofed with thatch, and fronting south with such precision as to serve as a sundial, and indicate the hour of noon. The fireplace was made of rough stone; the chimney, of boards plastered inside with clay. Both the fireplace and the chimney-flue were of immense capacity; so that, after a rousing fire had been kindled of a winter's evening, the family would occupy the spaces on each side of it, and look up through the chimney opening, and gaze at the stars. What visions of other days must have come over the old Pilgrim, as he sat there and heard the whistling winds and the roaring on the sea-beach, and saw through the chimney-flue the same planets that twinkled upon him on the Princen Graat of old Amsterdam!”

The “Memorial of the Chauncys,” by Mr. William Chauncey Fowler, gives an account of a family famous in New England religious history, and also distinguished in secular pursuits. President Chauncy of Harvard College was the first settler of the name in New England, — a man of honorable family, liberal education, and superior ability. His descendants in the male line are not very numerous. The pedigree in Mr. Fowler's book commences with Chauncy de Chauncy, who came from France with the Conqueror. How far back this is really authentic we have not examined, but the Chauncys were a very ancient house in Hertfordshire, and we doubt whether any other of the founders of Massachusetts could boast so high a lineage as could President Chauncy. A family descended in the female line from the first ancestor, and bearing the name, is still found among the Hertfordshire gentry.

We have far exceeded our intended limits, and must omit further examination of the very numerous publications on genealogy. Our desire has been to give our readers such information as will aid them in historical investigations, and to avoid any opinion as to the wisdom or justice of hereditary rank, or the utility of genealogical studies. We shall only say, that the subject of Peerages and Genealogies is too closely allied to history to be ignored, and that some knowledge of English noble families, and of the origin and nature of the English aristocracy, is essential to any thorough knowledge of English history.

mainly on grounds derived from ascertained facts as to the variation and degeneration of inferior animals.

-
37. — 1. *Evidence as to Man's Place in Nature*. By THOMAS H. HUXLEY, F. R. S., F. L. S., Professor of Natural History in the Jermyn Street School of Mines. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1863. 12mo. pp. 184.
2. *On the Origin of Species: or, The Causes of the Phenomena of Organic Nature. A Course of Lectures to Workingmen*. By THOMAS H. HUXLEY, Professor of Natural History in the Jermyn Street School of Mines. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1863. 12mo. pp. 150.

THESE books are popular exhibitions of the Darwinian theory. That this theory can ever be *demonstrated* is impossible; for it is admitted by its advocates, that the countless intermediate stages of development which it supposes have, most of them, left no discoverable vestiges. That it will remain the dominant belief of the scientific world seems to us improbable. But there is reason to think that it will be to a large extent and for some length of time adopted as a provisional hypothesis for the grouping of established facts and new discoveries in comparative anatomy. We would urge with regard to it the same considerations to which we have given expression as to the antiquity of man. It may at least express a portion of the truth. It may lead to the reduction of animated nature to a few primitive and ascertainable types; and even were it pushed as far as is claimed by Darwin and Huxley,—were it to be admitted—which we heartily deprecate—with regard to the physical structure of the human being,—it cannot reach the realm of reason, conscience, and will, it cannot cast a ray of doubt on our Divine sonship and immortal birth-right on the spiritual side, nor can it falsify the charter of our heavenly citizenship in the revelation which bears the incontestable signature of the Almighty.

ERRATUM.

Page 71, lines 2 and 3 from bottom, for "George and William Wyndham, Thomas Grenville," etc., read "George, William Wyndham, and Thomas Grenville," etc.